

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

JOSEPH DUNBAR,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 15-11573

Honorable Denise Page Hood

v.

DIRECTOR DANIEL HEYNS, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
and RELATED REQUESTS IN LETTERS**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration filed October 20, 2015. (Doc. No. 20) . On October 8, 2015, the Court entered an Order Dismissing the action without prejudice. (Doc. No. 18) For the reasons set forth below, the Court denies the motion.

The Local Rules of the Eastern District of Michigan provide that any motion for reconsideration must be filed within 14 days after entry of the judgment or order. E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(1). No response to the motion and no oral argument thereon shall be allowed unless the Court orders otherwise. E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(2). Defendant's motion is timely filed. The Local Rule further states:

(3) **Grounds.** Generally, and without restricting the

court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(3). A motion for reconsideration is not a vehicle to re-hash old arguments, or to proffer new arguments or evidence that the movant could have brought up earlier. *Sault Ste. Marie Tribe v. Engler*, 146 F.3d 367, 374 (6th Cir. 1998)(motions under Fed.R.Civ.P. 59(e) “are aimed at *re* consideration, not initial consideration”)(citing *FDIC v. World Universal Inc.*, 978 F.2d 10, 16 (1st Cir.1992)).

Plaintiff in his Motion for Reconsideration asserts that he submitted certain documents to the Court and to Deputy Clerk S. Burns. The Court's review of the documents submitted show that none of the documents submitted comply with the Court's previous orders. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration and letters re-hash the same arguments previously raised by Plaintiff. Any new argument not raised by Plaintiff in previous submissions cannot be considered by the Court in a Motion for Reconsideration.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration under E.D. Mich. LR 7.1 and relief requested in related documents (**Doc. No. 20; See also Doc. Nos. 19,**

**21, 22)** are DENIED.

S/Denise Page Hood  
Denise Page Hood  
United States District Judge

Dated: December 21, 2015

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on December 21, 2015, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/LaShawn R. Saulsberry  
Case Manager